

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-17, and 19-21 were pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended, no claims have been added, and claims 6, 13, and 20 have been canceled herein. Therefore, claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 12, 14-17, 19, and 21 remain pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these claims for at least the reasons presented below.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection, Bimson in view of Moore

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-17, and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0046244 of Bimson et al. (hereinafter "Bimson") in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0049672 of Moore et al. (hereinafter "Moore"). The Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting these claims, as amended. Therefore, the Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, all claimed limitations must first be taught or suggested by the prior art. *See, e.g., DyStar Textilfarben GmbH & Co. Deutschland KG v. C.H. Patrick Co.*, 464 F.3d 1356, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2006). The Office Action must then provide an explicit analysis supporting the rejection. *See KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007) ("a patent composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of its elements was, independently, known in the prior art"). While the Office Action can use one of several exemplary rationales from the MPEP to support an obviousness rejection under *KSR*, all the rationales still require the Office Action to demonstrate that all the claim elements are shown in the prior art. *See* MPEP §2143. As will be discussed below, the references cited by the Office Action do not teach or suggest each claimed limitation. For example, none of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest

accessing a Web page out of a plurality of Web pages of an e-commerce Web site, the plurality of Web pages comprising an electronic catalog of products arranged in a product hierarchy. Furthermore, neither reference teaches or suggests, alone or in combination, log in information that is selected from a first log in information to obtain a first privilege level for editing the Web pages and a second log in information to obtain a second privilege level for editing the Web pages, wherein the second privilege level is higher than the first privilege level, and invoking a web page editor having a graphical user interface for editing the accessed Web page in response to the submitted log in information having a privilege level sufficient to enable editing of the accessed Web page.

Bimson “relates generally to methods and apparatus for implementing changes to an internet website, and more particularly, to systems for defining and enforcing a common style of website page layout for use on an internet and intranet.” (paragraph 2) More specifically, Bimson describes “a content management application which is an intranet application for implementing changes to a website . . . [and which] provides a corporation the ability to define and enforce a common style of page layout in an intranet environment prior to introduction of the page layout to the internet website.” (paragraph 5) To this end, Bimson describes a workflow of the content management application for editing, approving, and implementing changes to a web site.

However, Bimson does not teach or suggest accessing a Web page out of a plurality of Web pages of an e-commerce Web site, the plurality of Web pages comprising an electronic catalog of products arranged in a product hierarchy. Rather, Bimson does not describe or relate to the arrangements of products represented on the web site, i.e., as a product catalog or arranged in a product hierarchy. Furthermore, Bimson does not teach or suggest log in information that is selected from a first log in information to obtain a first privilege level for editing the Web pages and a second log in information to obtain a second privilege level for editing the Web pages, wherein the second privilege level is higher than the first privilege level, and invoking a web page editor having a graphical user interface for editing the accessed Web

page in response to the submitted log in information having a privilege level sufficient to enable editing of the accessed Web page. Rather, to any extent Bimson may be considered to describe privileges, they seem to be with regard to who can perform which step of a given workflow but not different privilege levels for accessing and editing web pages representing a catalog of products arranged in a product hierarchy.

Moore is directed to “an object-oriented, template-driven interface for a customer to utilize in the design of the Web page . . . [that] allows the customer, through the use of the interface, to design the Web page.” (paragraph 16) That is, Moore describes a web page design tool for use in building a web page based on a template. However, Moore does not teach or suggest, alone or in combination with Bimson, accessing a Web page out of a plurality of Web pages of an e-commerce Web site, the plurality of Web pages comprising an electronic catalog of products arranged in a product hierarchy. The Applicants note that Moore mentions catalogs in the background portion. However, the Applicants also note that Moore does not teach or suggest, alone or in combination with Bimson, that these catalogs may be arranged in a product hierarchy. Even assuming if such a teaching inferred, neither reference teaches or suggests, alone or in combination, log in information that is selected from a first log in information to obtain a first privilege level for editing the Web pages and a second log in information to obtain a second privilege level for editing the Web pages, wherein the second privilege level is higher than the first privilege level, and invoking a web page editor having a graphical user interface for editing the accessed Web page in response to the submitted log in information having a privilege level sufficient to enable editing of the accessed Web page. Rather, Moore only seems to describe basic login information, of one level, to access a host of the web page when uploading the completed page (see paragraph 94)

Claim 1, upon which claims 2, 3, 5, and 7 depend, claim 8, upon which claims 9, 10, 12, and 14 depend, and claim 15, upon which claims 16, 17, 19, and 21 depend, each recite in part “accessing, on a web browser, a Web page out of a plurality of Web pages of an e-commerce Web site over an intranet link the plurality of Web pages of the Web site comprising

an electronic catalog of products arranged in a product hierarchy; submitting log in information to the Web site over the intranet link, wherein said log in information is selected from a first log in information to obtain a first privilege level for editing the Web pages and a second log in information to obtain a second privilege level for editing the Web pages, wherein the second privilege level is higher than the first privilege level, and wherein said intranet link is separate from an Internet communication link; invoking a web page editor having a graphical user interface for editing the accessed Web page in response to the submitted log in information having a privilege level sufficient to enable editing of the accessed Web page, wherein the web page editor is invoked on the web browser over the intranet link.” Neither Bimson nor Moore teach of suggest, alone or in combination, accessing a Web page out of a plurality of Web pages of an e-commerce Web site, the plurality of Web pages comprising an electronic catalog of products arranged in a product hierarchy. Furthermore, neither reference teaches or suggests, alone or in combination, log in information that is selected from a first log in information to obtain a first privilege level for editing the Web pages and a second log in information to obtain a second privilege level for editing the Web pages, wherein the second privilege level is higher than the first privilege level, and invoking a web page editor having a graphical user interface for editing the accessed Web page in response to the submitted log in information having a privilege level sufficient to enable editing of the accessed Web page. For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/071,945
Amdt. dated January 19, 2010
Reply to Office Action of October 19, 2009

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

/William J. Daley/
William J. Daley
Reg. No. 52,471

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300

WJD:jep
62398509 v1